

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ON NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKE	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
09/917,539	07/27/2001		R. Dennis Nesbitt	P-3611-2-D1-3-C1 2 01	SLD	3362
24492	7590	04/14/2003				
	ASSOCIATE		EXAMINER			
425 MEADO	ORLDWIDE IN	DUONG, THANH P				
	PO BOX 901 CHICOPEE, MA 01021-0901			ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				3711		()
				DATE MAILED: 04/	14/2003	V

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>							
. •	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
055	09/917,539	NESBITT ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tom P Duong	3711					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) c iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for cause the application to become ABANDO:	timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. & 133).					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 F</u>	ehruani 2003						
	s action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.					
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accep	ted or b) dobjected to by the Ex	kaminer.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
	aminer.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		() ()					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	. Kanan kanan arawa San I						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 							
application from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•					
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	9(e) (to a provisional application).					
a) The translation of the foreign language pro-	• •						
Attachment(s)	. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Information	ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) al Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 09/917,539

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-6, 8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (5,820,489) in view of Cavallaro (5,688,191) and Cavallaro (5,810,678) and Harris et al. (5,856,388). Sullivan discloses a golf ball having a core with PGA compression 45-85 or its Riehle compression 115-75 (Col. 5, lines 14-20) and a diameter of 1.54-1.545 inch (Col. 4, lines 54-55), a cover layer containing a high acid ionomer with Shore D hardness about 65 or greater and cover thickness of 0.08-0.13 inch (Col. 5, lines 22-26 and Abstract), Col. 23, lines 21-22). Sullivan does not disclose a mantle layer but one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that a golf ball can be fabricated with plurality of layers including a mantle layer which impact playing characteristics. Cavallaro '191 teaches that it is desirable to include a mantle layer which believes to have an effect on the "feel" of the golf ball. (Col. 8, lines 6-24). Cavallaro '678 also makes it clear that conventional two-piece balls provide maximum distance but the two-piece balls have a hard "feel" when struck by a club (Col. 1, lines 23-45). Cavallaro '678 further teaches that it is desirable to fabricate a multiplayer golf ball having a soft mantle layer to overcome the conventional two-piece hard "feel" (Col. 4, lines 28-38). In addition, Harris et al. '388 also makes it clear that golf ball

Application/Control Number: 09/917,539

Art Unit: 3711

manufacturers introduced a multiplayer golf balls with multiple intermediate layers or mantle layers in an effort to overcome the undesirable hard "feel" aspect of a conventional two-piece balls. Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Cavallaro '191 and/or Cavallaro '678 and/or Harris '388 to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate a mantle layer as taught by Cavallaro '191 or Cavallaro '678 or Harris '388 into Sullivan's invention in order to provide a soft "feel" upon impacting a club against the golf ball. Regarding claims 2-6, Cavallaro '191 discloses a mantle layer of thermoset materials (Abstract) with a mantle layer thickness of 0.025 to 0.125 inch (Col. 7, lines 34-36) and a styrene-butadiene material (Col. 4, lines 27-30), thermoplastic material of polybutylene terephthalate (Col. 4, lines 56-67). Applicant should note that the type of fillers in the mantle layer is a design choice since the selection of fillers is determined by filler cost, specific gravity, and polymer dispersity.

2. Claims 7 and 19-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art as applied in claim 1, above and further in view of Shama (4,848,770) and Schenk (4,085,937) and Boehm et al. (5,683,312). With respect to claims 7, 19-22, and 28-29, Sullivan and Cavallaro disclose the claimed invention except a vitreous or glassy mantle layer or ceramic layer but Sullivan does disclose the use of fillers such as limestone and silica in the core formulation (Col. 9, lines 19-22) and limestone is an inexpensive filler. Shama 770' teaches that a mantle layer contains a filler (Col. 3, lines 1-6 and Col. 3, lines 25-26) to control the weight of the finished golf ball, provide the compression, and cut resistance of the golf ball. In addition, it is also known in the art

Art Unit: 3711

that filler also provide reinforcement of the golf ball. Schenk 937' also teaches the use of filler such as precipitated silica in the formulation to reinforce the structure of the golf ball. Schenk also teaches use of glass microspheres in the formulation to provide cut resistance and control the weight of the golf ball (Col. 5, lines 57-67). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Sharma and Schenk to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the filler of Sharma with specific filler types of silica and glass microspheres of Schenk to control the weight, improve compression, and cut resistance as taught by Sharma and Schenk. Claims 23, 24 and 25-27 recite limitations similar to claims 10, 1, and 16-18. Thus, claims 23, 24, and 25-27 are rejected for the same reasons as applied in claims 10, 1, and 16-18, above. With respect to claim 28, the prior art disclose the claimed invention except the use of metal filler in the mantle layer; however, Boehm teaches the use of aluminum (Col. 4, lines 27-30). Thus, it would have been obvious in view of Sharma, Schenk, and Boehm to incorporate a metal filler as taught by Boehm in Sullivan and Cavallaro golf ball to control weight and provide reinforcement for the golf ball. With respect claim 29, each metal has its own specific gravity, and the selection of metal and/or alloy and its amount in the formulation must result a finished golf ball that complies with USGA weight limits. Claim 30 recites limitations similar to claim 14; thus, claim 30 is rejected for the same reasons as applied in claim 14, above.

Application/Control Number: 09/917,539

Art Unit: 3711

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 2/6/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. (1) Official Notice is replaced with Cavallaro '678 and Harris et al. '388 as teaching references for mantle layer. Cavallaro '191 and Cavallaro '678 and Harris '388 clearly teaches that the introduction of a mantle layer (intermediate layer) in a conventional two-piece golf ball provide a multi-layer golf balls with a soft "feel" over a two-piece ball which provides a hard "feel" from ball impact against a golf club. Thus, it would have been obvious and desirable in view of Cavallaro '191 and Cavallaro '678 and Harris et al. '388 to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the mantle layer to provide a golf ball with a soft "feel" over a hard "feel" of a conventional twopiece golf ball. (2) Applicant argues that the addition of a mantle layer to Sullivan '489 would result a golf ball too large. Sullivan clearly discloses under USGA rules that there is no restriction on the maximum diameter of a golf ball. (Col. 1, lines 62-67). (3) Sullivan '489 clearly discloses the core's Riehle compression of at least 75. This Riehle compression is the measurement for the core and it is independent from the other layers. (3) Regarding claim 29, USGA rules require a ball weigh cannot exceed more than 1.620 ounces. It is known to use metal filler in the golf ball to control the weight and moment of inertia. A higher specific gravity metal provides a ball with more weight and higher moment of inertia than a lower specific gravity metal. The cost of metal material, its availability, and its dispersity characteristics in polymer blend are the key factors in determining the choice of metal used in the formulation of a mantle layer. Thus, the selection of metal for the mantle layer is a design choice.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as

set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date

of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Tom P Duong whose telephone number is (703) 305-4559. The examiner

can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Paul Sewell can be reached on (703) 308-2126. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular

communications and (703) 873-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Tom Duong April 10, 2003

Paul T. Sewell
Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3700